IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	Group Art Unit: 3737
)	
FRAZIER et al.)	Confirmation No.: 3127
)	
Filed: 18 July 2003)	Examiner: Kish, James M.
)	
Serial No.: 10/622,242)	Docket No.: MR/99-024.D
)	
For: COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS FOR)	
USE WITH MAGNETIC RESONANCE	Ε)	
IMAGING SYSTEMS)	Date: 10 April 2007

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

37 C.F.R. \$1.116 AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION COMPLYING WITH REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH THEREIN

Dear Sir:

Applicants acknowledge receipt of a Final Office Action (FOA) dated 21 February 2007 concerning the patent application cited above. The FOA sets forth the following allowances, objections and rejections:

- Claims 16 and 18 are allowed;
- (2) Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (i.e., claim 1), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (none);
- (3) Claims 1, 5, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,494,036 to *Uber et al.*;
- (4) Claims 2-3, 10-11 and 16 [sic] are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uber et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 6,198,285 to *Kormos et al.*;

Rule 116 Amendment After Final Office Action U.S. Application Serial No. 10/622,242 Attorney Docket No. MR/99-024.D Page 2 of 11

- (5) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Uber et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 4,737,712 to *Stormont et al.*;
- (6) Claims 12-15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uber et al. in view of any one of U.S. Patents 3,829,195; 4,119,362; 4,183,618; and 4,360,249; and
- (7) Claim 13 is objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form.